



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

EPIGRAPHICA

BY MINTON WARREN

IN the archaic inscription recently discovered in the Roman forum occurs the word IOVESTOD. In the first publication in regard to the Stele, in the *Notizie degli Scavi* for May, 1899, Ceci recognized the possibility that this might stand for *iustod*, but rejected this interpretation in favor of *Iove estod*, although there is no interpunct such as is usually found between the words of the inscription. Hülsen, in the *Berliner Philologische Wochenschrift* for August 5, 1899, and Skutsch, in the *Litterarisches Centralblatt* for August 12 and September 23, contend that *iovestod* = *iustod*, and this view is still maintained by Skutsch in the *Berliner Philologische Wochenschrift* for March 31, 1900, in a review of Tropea's *La Stele Arcaica del foro Romano*. Comparetti, on the other hand, in *Atene e Roma*, II (1899), 10, reads *iou estod* = *diu estod*, *diu* being taken in the sense of 'by day,' which seems to me improbable. Perhaps additional evidence for the interpretation *iusto* may be derived from a hitherto unexplained gloss of Paulus, p. 74, ed. De Ponor: *Iovistae compositum a Iove et iustae*. See Mueller's edition for various attempted emendations. Given an early form *iovestae* or *iovistae* with the meaning of *iustae*, it is easy to see how the explanation would occur to a grammarian. Assuming, as we must, that *iovestae* was the earlier form, we should hardly expect the change to *iovistae* except as a result of popular etymology through the influence of *Iovis*. So von Planta, *Grammatik der Oskisch-Umbrischen Dialekte*, II, p. 211, speaking of Umbrian *esto*, says, "Im Lateinischen entspricht *iste, ista, istud* wohl mit *i* statt *e* nach *is, id*." Compare, however, for other views Lindsay, *Latin Language*, p. 430, and Stolz, *Historische Grammatik*, p. 138. The opposite change of *is* to *es*, before *t*, is better attested. See Quintilian, I, 4, 17, "*Quid? non e quoque i loco fuit? ut Menerua et leber et magester?*" See also instances of *sinester* and *minester* given in my edition of the *Codex Sangallensis*, 912, p. 129. Compare *Corp.* VI, 23774, *sinesteriore*; X, 2614, *sinest(eriorem)*; XIV, 1383,

senexteriori; 1473, *senesteriori*. These examples are given by Sommer, *Indogermanische Forschungen*, XI (1900), p. 28, and explained as partly due to the influence of *dexter*, and partly to popular etymology connecting them with *senex*. For other late examples see Corssen, II, 216. Stolz is probably right in saying that *i* in such a position differed little in pronunciation from *e*, and Sommer, *l. c.* p. 60, says, "Solche Formen beweisen nichts weiter als dass überhaupt das kurze *i* des Lateinischen eine offene Aussprache hatte wie ja öfter auf Inschriften *ē* for *i* erscheint." We may then consider *iovestae* and *iovistae* as practically the same. In the early period there doubtless existed as gen. s. of *ius*, *iovesis* (*ioveris*), and the gen. pl. *iovesum* (*ioverum*) would coincide in form with that which Varro, *L. L.* 8, 74, gives for Iuppiter. "*Neque oportebat consuetudinem notare . . . signa alios Ioum alios Ioverum.*" Perhaps we ought not to set aside so lightly as has been done by the editors, comparing Cicero *de Officiis*, 3, 29, the testimony of Apuleius *de Deo Socratis* 5, "*Nam et iusiurandum Iovisiurandum dicitur, ut ait Ennius,*" for we may have here a survival of an older form of *ius* which was misunderstood by the grammarians or by Apuleius. See also Festus, p. 468, ed. De Ponor, "*Naevius, Ius sacratum Iovis iurandum sagmine,*" which Ribbeck emends to *Iovis sacratum iūs iurandum sagmine*.

In Paulus, p. 73, ed. De Ponor, we find the gloss *iusa* : *iura*, followed by *iubere ponebatur pro dicere quod valet interdum pro decernere, ut: populus iussit*. This suggests that Festus and before him Verrius Flaccus in their fuller treatment may have connected *iubeo* with *ius*, a mistake, if mistake it be, which has been committed by many scholars since their time. Scaliger, in his *de causis L. L.* c. 32, derived *iubeo* from *ius habeo*, and Corssen repeatedly affirmed this derivation, which is the only one given by Harper. De Vit-Forcellini derive *ius* from *iubeo*, and Georges says of *ius* "von einer Wurzel mit *iubeo*." Otto Keller, in his *Lateinische Etymologien*, p. 64, and Wölfflin, in *Archiv*, VI, p. 434, still explain *iubeo* as = *ius habeo*, and the latter, to explain the construction of *iubeo* with *ut*, cites Terence, *Hecyra*, 243, where *ius esse* is followed by *ut te cogam*.

Comparative grammarians, however, have long abandoned this view. See Lindsay, *Latin Language*, p. 481, where *iubeo* is equated with *yū-dh-eyo*, cf. O. Ind. *yō-dhati*, 'is set in motion,' while the forms with

ou are said to correspond exactly with the O. Ind. causative yōdhāyāmi.¹ See also Hirt, *Indogermanische Forschungen*, X, pp. 28 ff.

Of old Indian forms Varro, however, knew nothing, and we may be reasonably certain that if he had been asked to etymologize *iubeo*, he would have pitched upon *ius* as offering the readiest solution both in form and meaning. The spelling *ious* is attested in inscriptions, and forms like *iousiset*, *iousit*, *iouserunt*, *iouserit*, must have suggested association with it. How early any such association was felt, we cannot of course tell, but it has occurred to me that possibly the original composer of the Duenos inscription meant to write *ioveset* = *iouset* = *iusit*, *ius-sit*, and that the correction of the second *e* to *a*, and the insertion of *i*, if it be a letter, after the first *e*, would not have been countenanced by the author. Thurneysen, one of the latest interpreters of the inscription, *Kuhn's Zeitschrift*, XXXV, pp. 193–212, would read *iovaset* in the sense of *iuverit*, claiming that the graver by error corrected the second *e* to *a* instead of the first. For a defence of the final *t* in *ioveset* as against the *d* of *feced* in the same inscription, see Thurneysen, *l. c.* p. 199, and compare *dedit* and *fecid* in two inscriptions (*Corp.* XIV, 4112) of apparently the same date on a Praenestine casket. (See Conway, *Italic Dialects*, p. 321.) Assuming then that *ioveset* may equal *iussit*, I would compare Macrobius, I, 12, 28, “*unde et mulieres in Italia sacro Herculis non licet interesse, quod Herculi cum boves Geryonis per agros Italiae duceret, sitienti respondit mulier aquam se non posse praestare, quod feminarum deae celebraretur dies, nec ex eo apparatu viris gustare fas esset, propter quod Hercules facturum sacrum delestatus est praesentiam feminarum et Potitio ac Pinario sacrorum custodibus iussit ne mulierem interesse permitterent.*” My interpretation of the first sentence of the inscription, *ioveset deivos goi med mitat, nei ted endo cosmis virco sied asted*, would be similar to that of Buecheler, usually a safe guide to follow, in *Rheinisches Museum*, XXXVI, p. 235, “*wer mich den Göttern Juppiter und Saturnus schickt, nicht soll Dich hinein begleiten eine Jungfrau oder dabeistehen,*” except of course that *deivos* is made the subject of *ioveset* and Jupiter and

¹ As long ago as 1869 Benfey proposed to derive *iubeo* from **yavas-dhd* with affix *aya*. Here **yavas*, older form of Sanskrit *yās*, would exactly correspond to *ioves-* in *iovestod*. Cf. *Abhandlungen der Kön. Gesell. d. Wiss. zu Göttingen* Bd. XVI, pp. 3–45, *Iubeo und seine Verwandte*.

Saturn are eliminated ; *cosmis*, I admit, to be still a puzzle ; *asted* I still think is better connected with *adsto*. Assimilation seems to have taken place early in this verb. The Ambrosianus of Plautus has *ast* in twenty places, *adst*, in only two. *Cas.* 728, *etiamne adstas?* (*astas* B). *Mil.* 201, *adstitit*. Naevius, *Com. Fr.* 26, has *astant* and *astat*. *Corp.* VI, 746, has *ara posita asstante sacerdote*, cf. Lucret. 1, 89, *ante aras adstare parentem*, and Ovid. *Met.* 8, 480, *Ante sepulchrales infelix astitit aras*. In the acts of the Arval Brethren we find both *astantibus* and *adstantibus*. In *Corp.* II, 745, we have *ast* for *astante*. In *Corp.* V, 895, *astante civibus*.

For *iussit* used in connection with a god compare Virgil, *Aen.* 7, 428 ; 12, 854 ; Plautus, *Amph.* 64 and 73 *iussit Iuppiter* ; *Cas.* 406, *Quia Iuppiter iussit meus* ; *Cas.* 408, *Quia iussit haec Iuno mea*. Plautus commonly uses the infinitive construction, but in *Amph.* 205, *Telebois iubet sententiam ut dicant suam*, he uses *ut* + subj. and elsewhere the subj. without *ut*. In the Duenos inscription, however, the *ne* clause may be taken as paratactic. Space forbids my attempting the interpretation of the inscription as a whole. My conjecture that *ioveset* = *iussit*, suggested by the form *iovestod*, perhaps deserves no better fate than has befallen Pauli's *io veisat*. I would only add, as a curious instance of *u* or rather *y* being represented by *ove* in a late inscription of the year 384, Buecheler, *Carmina Epigraphica*, III, v. 13, *movestes* for *mystes*, of which Buecheler remarks "quod monstrum Jahnius docuit *mustes* et *moestes* formarum conflictu esse partum."

In the *Mélanges D' Archéologie et d' Histoire* for 1890, Vol. X, pp. 303-316 and Plate VI, Louis Duvau under the title 'Ciste de Préneste' gives a number of inscriptions found upon a bronze cista of whose provenance Duvau simply says "une ciste découverte à Palestrina, et dont un célèbre collectionneur parisien veut bien nous communiquer le dessin." Elia Lattes, in his *Le Iscrizioni Paleolatini dei fittili e dei bronzi di provenienza etrusca* (Milan, 1892), repeats the inscription (133), and Conway gives it in his *Italic Dialects*, p. 321 f., where he says "Duvau vouches for the inscription and it seems almost too curious for a forgery, though it is suspicious that

he is not allowed to say where the bronze is." Lindsay also gives the inscription with a brief commentary (*Latin Inscriptions*, p. 31). The inscriptions on the cista, in the direction from left to right, are: 1, *confice piscim*; 2, *coenalia*; 3, *cofeci*; 4, *feri porod*; 5, *made mirecie*; 6, *misc sane*; 7, *asom fero*. Lindsay gives them in a different order. 2 (?), 3, 4, and 6 are written from right to left. Of 1 and 2 Conway says, "*confice piscim* said by an energetic cook (who is taking down from hooks two hind quarters of some animal) to another who is cutting or frying something; *coenalia* along the hind quarters that are being taken down." Conway does not interpret *coenalia*. Lindsay says, "the whole (scene) is entitled *coenalia*, *cenalia* Neut. Plur., 'a dinner scene.' The spelling *coenalia* is interesting, for it proves that even at this early period Latin *cena* had been wrongly connected with the Greek *κοινός*." Duvau, who seems not to have copied or seen the inscription himself, says, "Cette ciste est, par endroits, oxydée, et par suite, quelques parties de la scène ou des inscriptions peuvent n'être pas très certaines." Of the second inscription he says, "Elle se distingue extérieurement de toutes les autres par la forme relativement régulière et nettement archaïque de ses lettres; on n'y reconnaît pas la main malhabile à écrire de droite à gauche des inscriptions 3, 4, et 6; enfin on y trouve une forme de lettre, la seconde (an O open at the bottom), qui n'existe nulle part ailleurs dans la ciste. La lecture des six derniers caractères semble certaine: . . ENALIA . . . Cette ligne se distingue donc encore des six autres en ce qu'elle ne contient pas de verbe: elle ne fait sans doute pas partie du dialogue. Je serais porté à croire qu'elle a été gravée par un main différente et plus ancienne; qu'à l'origine c'était la seule inscription que portât notre ciste." He then discusses *coenalia*, which he recognizes ought to be *cenalia*. He asks, "Est-ce un composé latin de *cum* et d'un dérivé de *edere*? Est-ce un mot emprunté? Nous n'en savons rien." Finally, in despair he even proposes, with great doubt, to read COEPI ALIA.

For myself I should prefer to regard the inscription as a forgery than to accept the form *coenalia* in so archaic an inscription. Duvau dates it between 515 and 525 A. U. C.

From inscriptions and manuscripts we know that the spelling *cena* maintained itself until a late period. See the evidence given by Georges, *Lexikon der Lateinischen Wortformen*, p. 124, who says at the

end "Die Schreibung *coeno* erst sicher bei Isidor, 20, 2, 44." Add a late inscription of 462 A.D., *Corp.* VI, 8460, where *cenariorum* occurs, and the curious compound *inlustricenare*, *Corp.* X, 3692, Buecheler, *Carmina Epigraphica*, 255. The Ambrosianus of Plautus has uniformly *e* in *cena* and its derivatives, and this spelling is amply confirmed by the Oscan, Umbrian, and Sabine forms of the word.

The adjective *cenalis* is not elsewhere found. The scene represented is not a dinner, although it might be entitled 'preparations for a dinner.'

I propose to read the inscription from left to right AILANEOS. AI stands for *ait*, the final *t* being omitted, as it is in *made*, if the interpretation *madet* be correct. The word *ait* occurs in *Corp.* IV, 1375, AIT SECVNDV, and we may compare IV, 1679, *Edone dicit assibus hic bibitur*, etc. *Laneos* for *lanius* in a Praenestine inscription need not surprise us. Compare *fileai*, *Corp.* XIV, 4112, and *Fabrecio*, XIV, 3178, both from Praeneste. Moreover, in the Appendix Probi (see *Archiv*, XI, p. 307, the latest ed. by Heraeus) we find *Lanius non laneo*. Possibly LANEOS was the reading of our inscription, and the final letter of which Duvau is uncertain may have been a mere scratch. The second C in *cofeci*, as given by him, might well be read as S, and is so read by Lattes, and the letter taken as C in *coenalia* might well be a part of an S like that seen in ASOM.

Of course I shall be met with the assertion that the inscription is written in a retrograde direction, and I cannot deny that reading from left to right the letters J, E and H do have this form. This I account for by supposing, as Duvau remarks, that the graver was accustomed to write from right to left, and in writing from left to right, he still gave these letters in the retrograde form. Hübner notes in his *Exempla*, p. LXIII, that the form H occurs in *Corp.* IX, 4139; IX, 4990; VIII, 1083, and I have noted it repeatedly in the Vaticanus of Terence (C) in Scene Headings that have been added by a corrector. Moreover, Conway gives a similar explanation (*Italic Dialects*, p. 129) in speaking of an Oscan inscription, the Memnim-curse. "The variation in the direction of the letters is remarkable. The inscription is mainly written from left to right, and the Oscan signs reversed, but except in ll. 1, 2, 4 and 5, their normal position is frequently retained. . . . From this it seems to me clear that the variation is not due to ignorance of Oscan, but to a conscious attempt to write it from left to right."

Of inscriptions 3 and 4 Conway says, "*cofeci* said by a man holding out a dish of viands in response to another holding an empty dish downwards who says *feri porod* (or *potrod*).” The R of POROD has a peculiar form, but I do not think a ligature for TR is probable, as there are no other ligatures in this inscription. Duvau interprets as "*feri porro*, frappe encore, continue à tuer.” Lindsay interprets "strike away," and in his *Latin Language*, p. 568, he cites this inscription to prove that in *retro, citro, ultro, porro*, the *ō* represents earlier *ōd*, the abl. case ending of O-stems. The interpretation seems probable enough, and it is only with some diffidence that I propose another. In Petronius, c. 56, the words '*porri et persica*:' *flagellum et cultrum accepit*, have given rise to much discussion. Friedländer remarks, "Dass die *porri* das *flagellum* bedeuten, erklärt Jacobs wohl mit Recht daraus, dass eine der beiden Gattungen des *porrum sectile* oder *sectivum* hiess (zu Martial, 3, 47, 8) und *flagello secare* eine geläufige Verbindung war." See also *Lexicon Petronianum* sub verbo. Possibly *porod* for *porrod* in our inscription is an ablative of *porrus* = *flagellum*, i. e. a stick, or rod, or scourge. The word perhaps is preserved in this sense in Plaut. *Poen.* 817 ff., where Milphio says at the beginning of a scene :

Exspécto, quo pactó meae techinaé processuraé sient.

Studeo hunc lenonem pérdere : qui méum erum miserum mácerat :

Is me autem porro vérberat, incúrsat pugnis, cálcibus,

where *porro* may be an ablative with *verberat*, as *pugnis* and *calcibus* with *incursat*. Of course, it has always been regarded as the adverb. If we can accept it as a noun, light is at once thrown upon the Petronius passage. Körting, in his *Lateinisch-romanisches Wörterbuch* under *porrum*, says, "Ob span. cat. ptg. *porra*, Keule mit dickem Ende (auch ungehobelter Kerl) u. das adj. *porro*, ungeschliffen, plump, bäuerisch, hierher gehören, bleibe dahingestellt, denkbar aber ist es immerhin. Der Vergleichungspunkt des Lauches mit der Keule würde in der dicken Knolle des ersteren zu finden sein," vgl. Dz. 448, *porra*. Spanish dictionaries which I have consulted give "*porra* a club, *porrada* a knock or blow with a club headed stick, *porrázo* a blow with a club, but generally used for any blow or stroke with any instrument, or with the hand." Possibly this use then was as old as Plautus or as our inscription, and there is no need to differentiate the stem of

porrus, club, stick, from that of *porrum*, *porrus*, leak. If we accept *feri porro* in this sense, the reference may be to the dog in the scene, who apparently is about to make a spring for the dish containing viands carried by the person to whom the words *feri porro* are addressed. Compare Donatus to *Eun.* II, 3, 66, where in the comment on the words *Homo quatietur certe cum dono foras* Donatus says, "Vel sic dixit : FORAS QVATIETVR ut desit *versum*, ut sit FORAS VERSVM VERBERABITVR ut verberetur et fugetur foras. Nam et pervulgatae consuetudinis dictum est. *Feri canem foras* hoc est feriendo canem foras eiice." Conservative readers, who may be willing to make *feri* refer to the dog, will perhaps prefer to take *feri porro* in the sense of *feri foras*. My principal object in dealing with this inscription has been to do away with the form *coenalia*.